

**From:** Chuck Scott  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 12/20/01 1:29pm  
**Subject:** Comment on Microsoft settlement

I have been using Microsoft Windows software for well over 20 years now for both business and personal use. I can not begin to fathom how it is that the government would say that improving your product is a detrimental to consumers. In order to improve your product you have to stay competitive. Microsoft did just that. If you look at the root cause of everything that has been laid at the feet of Microsoft I think you will find that personal greed and ego were as much to blame for what happened as anything Microsoft did in terms of business deals. If you really look at this objectively you will see that Microsoft is the leader of this industry and certainly is not the detractor it is made out to be.

I am sure that their competitors would love to hamstring Microsoft so they can force you to pay bloated prices for their software which they do not test very thoroughly and the support for which is poor if it exists at all. I recently shifted to Windows 2000 at work and Windows XP at home. The quality is remarkable and if recent experience holds true the return on investment period will happen much earlier in the lifecycle than I ever imagined possible.

And lets talk about Netscape. I began using it when it first hit the market and used Navigator quite a while after MS Internet Explorer came out. I never cared what was pre-installed on the PC I went with the software that was best suited for my needs. What influenced me to change was to IE was when the level of quality and performance in IE surpassed Netscape. Netscape got sloppy and IE became a superior product which was incrementally improved and for which quality and stability and security were more important than ego, flashiness, and advertising opportunities. Netscape did themselves in, Microsoft's only real hand in this was building a better product and marketing properly.

And as a consumer of quit a large library of non-MS software that runs on Windows I would also like to make a point that Microsoft has enabled a huge and extremely productive industry around the world. Because of this the price of software for personal and business use is affordable by a great many people. If Microsoft's competitors were to have their way they would control the price and access. And limit it to running only on their hardware. The key point here is that Microsoft was successful in building a operating system that runs on wide range of hardware from many manufacturers at a price that is affordable to nearly every one. This sounds to me like something that is good for consumers and business.

So the agreement more than exceeds the necessary level of "protection" we need from this industry leader. Accept it as is and get on with more important things. Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>